



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

stellen geriet Francke von Anfang an auf schwankenden Boden. Im ganzen spendeten ihm denn auch nur Schulmänner mit wesentlich praktischen Gesichtspunkten vollen Beifall. Die englische Bearbeitung wird viel eher an ihrem Platz sein, insofern Francke hier zu einer reineren Ausstrahlung seines Besten gelangen kann, ohne peinliche Nebenwirkungen hervorzurufen. Für sein Bestes und Tiefstes halten wir die Darstellung seines eignen Erlebnisses an deutscher Kunst und Dichtung, denn mancher von uns wird schon sehr viel gewonnen haben, wenn er ästhetisch mit Augen wie Franckes schauen lernt. Der Wert des Buches wird also am ehesten zur Geltung kommen, wenn es als eines aufgefasst wird, das sich in Wahrheit viel weniger mit Deutschland und deutschem Geistesleben als mit Amerika und amerikanischem beschäftigt.

H. W. NORDMEYER.

University of Illinois.

THE SUPERNATURAL IN TRAGEDY, by Charles Edward Whitmore. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1915. 12mo. pp. viii+370.

In his thesis "The Supernatural in Tragedy," presented in 1911 at Harvard University for the doctorate in Comparative Literature, Dr. Whitmore considers that group of forces, which may intervene with incalculable effect in the affairs of man. The representatives of this extra-human realm, are first, Fate, or, if we use a more concrete term, God or gods; second, angels and devils; third, witches; and fourth, ghosts. As they are conceived to be inherently far from friendly to man, authors do treat them primarily with serious intent; in drama we find them principally in tragedy. Similarly, any serious use of the supernatural in drama is, Dr. Whitmore thinks, a sufficient token of tragic intent. Thus the author of "The Supernatural in Tragedy" comes to a new definition of tragic action. Reviewing, from this point of view, the tragedy in its chief periods, Dr. Whitmore believes he sees in it a continuous development of the use of the supernatural. By virtue of its origin in a universal instinct, which prompts man to take an interest in the things beyond mortal life and experience, the supernatural, the author holds, possesses a fundamental unity. He, moreover, sees in the supernatural the chief inspiration of tragedy and maintains that a real causal connection underlies the two. As a proof for this contention he adduces the parallel results of the two chief periods in the development of tragedy with their independent evolution, the fifth century B. C. in Greece and the Elizabethan age in England. In his opinion it is due exactly to their use of the supernatural that these two periods stand out as land-marks in the history of tragedy. But here the writer of this review joins issue with Dr. Whitmore.

Seemingly the author of "The Supernatural in Tragedy" does not consider Goethe's *Egmont* a tragedy because of its lack of the supernatural. Nor are Lessing's *Emilia Galotti*, Schiller's *Maria Stuart*, Kleist's *Prinz von Homburg*, Grillparzer's *Hero and Leander*, Hebbel's *Maria Magdalena*, Sudermann's *Magda*, Schnitzler's *Free Game*, Hauptmann's *Rose Bernd*, or, to go outside of Germany, Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People*, Strindberg's *The Father*, Becque's *The Vultures*, and Galsworthy's *Justice* tragic according to this new definition of tragedy. It is here that we touch upon the weakest point in this, on the whole, very commendable book. In glancing at the table of contents the present writer was struck by the fact that, in this study on tragedy, the drama of Germany has been entirely ignored. Now one well realizes that the field of tragedy is a vast one, and that the author was forced to limit himself to certain periods in its development. But because this book fails to consider the fact that many German plays, in spite of their lack of the supernatural element, have been some of the noblest contributions to the history of tragedy, its evaluation of the supernatural in tragedy must necessarily be of lesser value. As a classification and verification of the supernatural element in the tragedy of the periods under discussion, however, it is quite valuable. It is also to its detriment that it leaves out of consideration those German plays, which do contain the supernatural element, as for instance the German mystery and miracle-plays, in which the supernatural in the person of the devil has attained its highest development in the middle ages.

"*Wunder dulden wir nur in der physikalischen Welt, in der moralischen muss alles seinen Lauf behalten,*" is the pronouncement of Lessing in regard to the use of the supernatural in the drama. On this point he endorses the Aristotelian theory, which does not tolerate the supernatural in the action of the drama. This applies to drama only. It is quite a different thing with the opera. In the opera the music furnishes the element which permeates the action, carries it along and lifts it up from the ground of reality. In the opera we may encounter gods, angels and devils, elves, sprites, sylphs, nymphs, Rhine maidens, and all other charming and interesting personages, by whatever name they may go, whose acquaintance we make in the nursery; the drama, however, knows mortal man only. No god, no ghost may enter the drama.¹ Admitting that the modern drama resembles the Greek tragedy somewhat in its conception of Fate as an overruling power beyond our control, we must bear in mind that this power is not supernatural, but natural. Its habitation is not in heaven or hell, but on earth. It is of man's own make. The fate which nowadays crushes the will of man is embodied in custom and convention, in instinct and environment. "*In deiner Brust sind deines Schick-*

¹ Cf. M. J. Rudwin, *Modern Passion Plays*, The Open Court, XXX(1916), 281.

sals Sterne," says Schiller. The symbolism with its supernatural element, which, on the whole, is rather suggestive than expressive, is in modern times merely languishing on the stage. The only vital drama of today is the naturalistic drama, and this shows no interest whatever in the supernatural. As in modern life, so in modern drama, which aims to be a photographic reproduction of life, every trace of trust in moral intelligences which are not members of human society has been eliminated.

The supernatural is not essential to tragedy. The fact that two periods of chief importance in the history of tragedy employ the supernatural does not necessarily prove that it is essential. The drama of both of these periods as well as the medieval religious drama owe their connection with the supernatural to their origin, and their power and depth is due, not so much to the presence of the supernatural, as to the fact that in their use of the supernatural they were in harmony with popular belief. The sympathy of the Attic masters with their theme, which was religious, is the essential element of their success. The chief merit of the English dramatists of the Elizabethan age consists in their artistic use of the popular superstition of the time, by which they succeeded in infusing life into the Senecan ghost. It is quite irrelevant to our point whether or no they themselves shared these superstitions of the Protestantism of their time, the Reformation which banished all poetry, all beauty, all joy from life, and in their stead retained the devils, the witches, and the ghosts. The harmony of drama and life is the secret of the success of the drama of the Elizabethan age as of all ages. Its evolution was furthered by the conditions in England, which were at that time very favorable for a development in the drama. The divorce of tragedy from the life of the people in the other countries, where less favorable conditions prevailed, made similar results impossible there.

The popularity of the ghost, so characteristic of the Elizabethan age in England, Dr. Whitmore traces to a native interest, on the part of both playwrights and public, in the supernatural, an interest which is already evident in the medieval sacred drama. This interest in superhuman personages, Dr. Whitmore holds, has led in England to the formation of a definite method of dealing with them, which made for a close and vital connection between the supernatural and action. It seems strange, though, that the interest in the supernatural has continued, but that the particular object of this interest has changed. The English miracle-plays show not a single example of the type of supernatural being so popular in the Elizabethan drama: the ghost (page 205). But admitting that the shifting of interest from the one type of supernatural to the other is due to the influence of Seneca, the present writer fails to see wherein the medieval religious drama in England

shows a deeper interest in any one member of the Christian hierarchy of supernatural personages than is the case on the Continent. The devil constitutes the chief supernatural personage in the medieval sacred plays. He made his appearance on the boards shortly after his colleague from heaven, and almost from the beginning of his career he began to influence the action to such an extent, and to attract the attention of the spectators to such a degree, that he could well boast that without him there would be no play. Thanks to the medieval Christian notion that the devil with his incalculable power and malevolent purpose was the source of all evil acts, he became the mover of the entire dramatic action and thus more than satisfies all the requirements which the author of the book under discussion lays down for the tragic supernatural. But it is in Germany, and not in England, where this representative of the supernatural world has received his fullest development. While the devil-scenes in the German religious drama show a most striking popularity and elaboration, the devil's rôle in the English miracle-plays has not made any special development.

In his estimate of the relative merits of the English and French mystery and miracle-plays Dr. Whitmore is somewhat biased in favor of the English. The French undoubtedly attained in their sacred plays a higher level of artistic perfection than any other people of Europe. In verbosity, scholastic subtlety and love of quibbling, faults which the author charges to the French drama, the English religious plays are not far behind. The *processus Sathanae* is by no means restricted to France. It found its way across the Channel. The reviewer admits the truth of Dr. Whitmore's statement that the devil in the French mystery and miracle-plays is essentially mechanical, puppet-like. The French people lack, it would seem, a sense of appreciation of the devil. In their portrayal of the devil, the Frenchmen have never done him justice. Of the more important literatures of Europe the literature of France is the only one which has failed to produce a grand devil. We will look in vain in the literature of France for a devil worthy to take his place with Dante's Lucifer, Calderon's Lucifer, Milton's Satan, and Goethe's Mephistopheles. We would bring eternal shame on the heads of these noble representatives of the idea of evil if we were to place at their side that charlatan and arch-bohemian, LeSage's Asmodeus.

For the best representative of the supernatural in medieval religious drama we must turn not to England, but to Germany. The superiority of the German devil to the English devil cannot be called into question at all. The English devil is, first of all, not indigenous. "The devils of Great Britain," says Moncure Daniel Conway,² "are nearly all German." The difference in

² M. D. Conway, *The Devil in Leipzig*, *Fraser's Magazine* LXXIX (1869), 375.

his importance as a dramatic figure in the middle ages in the different countries is, however, chiefly due to a difference in the *mise-en-scène* of the mystery and miracle-plays in England and on the Continent. While in France and Germany we have a vast fixed stage with a tripartite division and a great number of mansions, the national type of stage in England was the pageant. A cycle was divided into a number of scenes or episodes, each of which was presented on a separate car or pageant, and the whole cycle thus moved in sequence about the city, stopping for presentation at certain appointed places. This mode of presentation was, of course, more adequate dramatically. It cut down the number of mansions and characters to a minimum, and may in the end have brought about a somewhat more closely knit action. A natural consequence of this mode of staging, however, was a reduction of the supernatural element. The devil's rôle was greatly curtailed. While in France and Germany, but particularly in the latter country, the devil could at any moment rush forth from his habitation of clashed kettles and caldrons and participate in the action at will, in England he had to limit his action to but a few episodes. Hence the devil's gradual decline in influence on the English stage. As a dramatic figure he falls more and more into the background. In the moralities he is forced to play the part of a contemptible buffoon and share "honors" with his younger step-brother, the Vice. His rôle as comedian is finally given back to the supernatural fun-makers of purely Germanic origin, who are known to us from the Kalends and the Feast of Fools, and the devil-plays pass over definitely into comedy and satire. Puck in Shakespeare's *Midsummer Night's Dream* is a pure Germanic sprite and has nothing in common with his predecessor of Hebrew or Babylonian genealogy.

This, however, was not the fate of the German stage devil. He continued to play his rôle in the religious drama in certain Catholic communities. He was, until the beginning of the nineteenth century, a very important participant in the action of the Passion on the stage at Oberammergau. Where the Reformation abolished the sacred drama, the devil went over into the repertoire of the Shrove-tide farces. He even found his way into the learned drama. When the opera started on its independent career in the seventeenth century, it employed the devil in a singing rôle. Thanks to the two strains of blood coursing in his veins, the Oriental and the Germanic, he could be at will a tragedian and a comedian. In heaven and hell, he is everywhere at home. God and man, he meets them both on equal terms. It is perhaps partly to the credit of his arch-enemy Luther that the devil continued to live and thrive in Germany. From him and none other has the devil received strong re-inforcements. Luther and his followers filled Germany with devils by diabolizing all vices. The devil, however, could not save the German drama. While in England

conditions were wholly favorable for the development of whatever inherent dramatic skill there existed in her people, the drama of Germany was buried under the ruins of the country. It was from England that help finally came to Germany. The English comedians helped to resuscitate the German drama.

It is a pity that Dr. Whitmore has found no references for the devil in the miracle-plays in England, a fact which he admits in his bibliography. This is very strange, though, as both Cushman³ and Eckhardt⁴ are listed by Chambers in his bibliography, to whose "ample store of erudition and the wealth of bibliographical matter" Dr. Whitmore refers in the bibliographical note, with which he prefaces his chapter "The Medieval Sacred Drama." A study on the devil in the medieval religious plays of Germany did not appear till 1914.⁵ Haslinguis' dissertation,⁶ which deals with the devil in the medieval drama in France, England, Germany and the Netherlands, also made its appearance after Dr. Whitmore's submission of his thesis for his degree. A number of other important references for the supernatural in drama have escaped the attention of Dr. Whitmore. Hild's valuable study on the devil in Greek religion and literature⁷ is unknown to him. The place of the supernatural in drama has already been studied as a whole in an essay, published more than twenty years ago by Ringseis, in the well-known Catholic journal *Historisch-politische Blätter*.⁸ But the author of "The Supernatural in Tragedy" is

³ L. W. Cushman, *The Devil and the Vice in the English Dramatic Literature before Shakespeare*. *Studien zur englischen Philologie*, Heft VI. Halle, 1900.

⁴ E. Eckhardt, *Die lustige Person im älteren englischen Drama (bis 1642)*. *Palaestra* XVII, Berlin, 1902.

⁵ M. J. Rudwin, *Die Teufelsszenen im geistlichen Drama des deutschen Mittelalters*. Göttingen und Baltimore, 1914. This dissertation also forms the first part of the writer's monograph: *Der Teufel in den deutschen geistlichen Spielen des Mittelalters und der Reformationszeit. Ein Beitrag zur Literatur-, Kultur- und Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*. *Hesperia: Schriften zur germanischen Philologie*, Nr. 6. Göttingen und Baltimore (The Johns Hopkins Press), 1915.

⁶ E. J. Haslinghuis, *De duivel in het drama der middeleeuwen*. Leiden, 1913. G. Roskoff in his *Geschichte des Teufels*, Leipzig, 1869, also devotes a chapter to the devil on the medieval stage (vol. I, pp. 359-404).

⁷ J. A. Hild, *Etude sur les Démons dans la religion et la littérature des Grecs*. Paris, 1881. In regard to Shakespeareana the author may further be referred to Tieck's essay on the supernatural in Shakespeare, which served as introduction to his translation of the *Tempest* (1793).

⁸ E. Ringseis, *Ueber die Einmischung des Uebernatürlichen im Drama*, *Historisch-politische Blätter*, CXIV(1894), 260-8. This short article by Miss Ringseis has, however, more religious zeal than sound logic to its credit.

unaware of this article also. It does not seem that Dr. Whitmore consulted Creizenach's *Geschichte des neueren Dramas*, and one wonders whether one could now afford to ignore Creizenach in any serious work on the drama. By consulting this authority on the history of the drama, Dr. Whitmore might have spared himself a few inaccuracies in regard to the medieval drama.

The reviewer does not know whether the book does not lose rather than gain by the frequent summarizing and recapitulating in which Dr. Whitmore indulges in order to emphasize the salient points of his discussion. He is certainly to be commended for the thorough proof-reading. The reviewer has been unable to discover more than one typographical error (correspondance on page 343) in the text. It is, therefore, inconceivable how the author could have overlooked the serious grammatical error in the title of the two dissertations on the supernatural personages on the French mystery-stage. In the foot-notes and the bibliography we read: *Die Teufel* (and *Die Engel*) *auf die mittelalterlichen Mysterien-Bühne Frankreichs*.

In spite of the few criticisms the present writer has had to raise he does not wish to give the impression that he considers the book of small value. "The Supernatural in Tragedy" is a very valuable contribution to the critical literature on the drama. It is informative, lucid, and, on the whole, accurate. The book does not make any claim to finality. The author hopes that it may serve as a stimulus for further investigation in this field. For it as a *Versuch* the reviewer has unstinted praise.

MAXIMILIAN J. RUDWIN.

University of Illinois.

ENGLISH LITERATURE FROM WIDSITH TO THE DEATH OF CHAUCER: A SOURCE BOOK, by Allen Rogers Benham. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1916.

The aims and methods of this substantial volume are set forth clearly in its preface. "The title of this venture is to be taken seriously; the work is a *source-book*, not an *anthology* nor a *text-book*; it exemplifies and urges in literary history the same methods that have long been successfully used in constitutional or political history. . . . The object of a source-book is to present to a reader, who has perhaps little leisure and meager library resources at his disposal, such documents from an age as fundamentally explain the life, ideals, and spirit thereof." It differs from an anthology, since "an anthology aims to form taste; a source-book, to train judgment. The former is a means to appreciation; the latter, to scholarship." The source-book differs again from an text-book because it forsakes a method which, says Professor